

REMARKS

Amendment

Applicants are amending Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-26, 28-30 and 32-34 to correct informalities in the claims and to clarify the claim language. These amendments are not in response to a patentability rejection and add no new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (U.S. 2002/0197565) in view of Speakman (U.S. 6,713,389) and Aoki (U.S. 2005/0237350). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 19 recites the features of discharging a composition on an object to *form a plurality of first resist patterns*...exposing the plurality of first resist patterns with light using a photomask...and removing one of the first portion and the second portion by developing *the plurality of first resist patterns to form a plurality of second resist patterns*. Hence, the method of Claim 19 involves forming a plurality of second resist patterns by exposing and developing the plurality of first resist patterns. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Wu discloses a surface of a semiconductor substrate 40 comprising a dielectric layer 42 and a plurality of contact electrodes 44 disposed with the dielectric layer 42. An amorphous silicon layer 46 is set over the surfaces of dielectric layer 42 and the contact electrodes 44, and a photoresist layer 48 is disposed on a top surface of the amorphous silicon layer 46 (see Fig. 6 and para. [0018] in Wu). Wu also discloses forming a patterned photoresist layer 49 by exposing and developing the photoresist layer 48 (see Fig. 10 and para. [0023] in Wu).

If for argument-sake, one assumes that the first pattern of Claim 19 corresponds to a photoresist layer 48 of Wu and the second pattern of Claim 19 corresponds to a patterned photoresist layer 49 of Wu (which Applicants do not admit), Wu teaches forming a patterned photoresist layer (49) by exposing and developing one photoresist layer (48), not a plurality of resist patterns as in Claim 19.

The other cited references also do not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Independent Claims 23, 27 and 31 have a similar feature.

Therefore, independent Claims 19, 23, 27 and 31 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 19, 23, 27 and 31 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 26, 30 and 34

The Examiner also rejects Claims 22, 26, 30 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Speakman and Aoki and further in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. 2006/0263722). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 21, 25, 29 and 33

The Examiner also rejects Claims 21, 25, 29 and 33 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Speakman and Aoki and further in view of Bibl (U.S. 2006/0007271). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Speakman and Aoki and further in view of Park (U.S. 2003/0202132). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 13 has similar features, as discussed above for Claim 19.

Therefore, for similar reasons as discussed above, independent Claim 13 is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 13 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully

requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 16-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, Speakman, Aoki and Park and further in view of Hagino (U.S. 5,380,670). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 16 has similar features, as discussed above for Claim 19.

Therefore, for similar reasons as discussed above, independent Claim 16 is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 16 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568